

## The Daily Courant.

Monday, January 13. 1707.

London, January 13.

A Continuation of the *Memoirs shewing that the French Protestants who retir'd out of France for the Sake of Religion, ought not to be depriv'd of the Profits of their Estates*: The former Part of which *Memoirs* was given in the Courant of Friday last.

**I**N the Second Place, it must be granted, that according to all the Rules of Justice Equity and Reason, the Protestants of France ought not to have been depriv'd of so lawful a Right, without some weighty Cause given and plain Delinquency on their Part.

In the third Place, the Edict revoking that of Nantes fully justifies them in that particular, since it does not alledge any Cause given by them.

In the fourth Place, if the Relation that is between the King and his Subjects be consider'd, it must be own'd there was no Ground for that Revocation: The French Protestants, in the Quality of the King's Subjects, were bound to be faithful and obedient to him; that is the Duty of Subjects to their King. The French Protestants are not liable to any Reproach on that Score; but have strictly kept themselves within the Duties of Fidelity and Obedience; of which they have given Proofs on important Occasions. The Duke of Orleans returning into France in 1632, was quickly joyn'd by a great Number of Malecontents: The Bishops of Alby, Uzès, Nîmes, Aleis, St. Pons, and Lodeve, went in to the Duke de Montmorency who was at the Head of the Party. On the contrary the Protestants serv'd the King with great Courage. The second Consul of Nîmes, who was a Protestant, kept that City obedient to the King, and turn'd out the Bishop and the first Consul, who favour'd the Duke of Orleans. The Inhabitants of the Town of Montauban sent Deputies to Morceaux to assure the King of their Loyalty, and offer'd to march out to meet and fight the Duke's Troops if they should advance within a League of their Town. This is fully apparent by a Declaration of Lewis XIII, of the 23d of August 1632, concerning the said Duke de Montmorency, in which his Majesty says, "That the Duke of Orleans and that Lord had endeavour'd to corrupt the chief of the Nobility, and to procure the best Places of Languedoc to be betray'd to them; but that they had courageously withstood their open Sollicitations and broke their secret Intrigues; even the Cities inhabited by those of the pretended reform'd Religion, being satisfied with the Gentleness of his Government and the Performance of his Promises, had so faithfully oppos'd them, that he had real Cause to be contented therewith, and to continue to treat them favourably, as he had resolv'd to do, and would do always."

In 1651, the Protestants of Montauban, Nîmes, of the Sevrènes, and of the Vivarets, were powerfully solicited by the Prince of Condé to joyn with his Party; which they refus'd, and at their own Expence put themselves in Arms to serve the present King: Their Fidelity in that Conjuncture kept Xaintonge, Languedoc, and Part of Guienne from revolting: The King express'd his Acknowledgement of it by a Declaration publish'd in their Favour, the 21st of May 1652, after his Majority had been declar'd, confirming the Edict of Nantes, and commanding it to be observ'd, all Letters and Arrets, as well of the Council as of the Sovereign Courts, or other Judgements contrary thereunto notwithstanding. In that Declaration these Words are remarkable, "our said Subjects of the pretended reform'd Religion have given us certain Proofs of their Affection and Fidelity, especially in the present Conjuncture, with which we are intirely satisfied."

The Protestants acquitting themselves of the Duties arising from their Relation to the King, it follows by necessary and just Consequence, that the

King was oblig'd on his Part to allow them Protection and Justice. 'Tis indubitable, that Justice and Equity require the King should maintain them in the Right they had lawfully acquir'd, and of which they were in Possession, seeing on their side they had done nothing to forfeit that Right.

In the fifth Place, the Difference between this Edict of Revocation, and the Edicts which in Favour of the Protestants establish'd Liberty of Conscience and the publick Exercise of their Religion, deserves to be consider'd. The first Edict in January 1561 was debated in a most solemn Assembly call'd on purpose for treating of Affairs of State and the Publication of an Edict: In the Preamble are these Words, "After having long and maturely consult'd of this Affair with the Queen, our most honoured and beloved Lady and Mother, our most dear and well beloved Uncle the King of Navarre our Lieutenant General representing our Person throughout all our Kingdoms and Territories, and other Princes of our Blood, and Members of our privy Council. And at the End of the Preamble these Words are remarkable, "All these Things having been well and maturely consider'd and debated in the Presence of Us and of our said Lady and Mother, by so great and venerable an Assembly, we have upon their Advice and mature Deliberation, commanded and ordain'd, &c. And the Preamble of the Edict of Nantes has these Words, "Having with the Advice of the Princes of our Blood, other Princes and Officers of the Crown, and other great and venerable Persons of our Council of State, in our Presence, well and diligently weigh'd and consider'd this whole Affair. Instead of this, the Edict of Revocation importing no less than the Desolation of Five hundred thousand Families of good and faithful Subjects, was drawn up by the M. de Chateaufort, and by certain Jesuits whose Suggestions he never fail'd to make Use of in contriving the Arrets and Declarations that pass'd thro' his Hands concerning Religion. The Truth of this Fact is attested by a Letter of the Marquis de Louvois written the 5th of November 1685, to the Duke de Noailles Governour of Languedoc, in which is this Passage. *I do not at all doubt, but the Quartering of Soldiers pretty thick upon these few of the Protestant Nobility and Commoners that are left, will cure them of the Error they are in about the Edict which M. de Chateaufort has help'd us to.* The Error he speaks of was this; the Protestants believ'd, that according to the Tenour of the last Article of that Edict (of which we shall speak at large by and by) they might continue in the Kingdom, keep on their Trades, and enjoy their Goods and Estates, without being troubled or hinder'd under the Pretext of Religion. The honestest and wisest Roman Catholics were of the same Opinion. And in that Assurance many of the Protestants laid aside the Measures they had taken to retire with their Families out of the Kingdom. Several came voluntarily out of Places in which they had till then safely conceal'd themselves: The most distrustful among them could not imagine, that so solemn a Promise was made to be broken the next Day. This Edict was not brought into the King's Council to be debated; for that would infallibly have been express'd according to the usual Form, had it been done.

But to return to the principal subject of these *Memoirs*:

The 10th Article of the said Edict of Revocation runs thus: "We do by most express and reiterated Injunctions, forbid all our Subjects of the said pretended reform'd Religion, them, their Wives and Children, to depart our said Kingdom, Countries and Territories of our Obedience, or to convey out of the same their Goods and Effects, on the Penalty of the Gallies for the Men, and of Imprisonment and Confiscation of Estate for the Women." This

This Prohibition is not only contrary to natural Liberty, but is particularly contrary to the Liberty that ought to be allow'd in the Matter of Religion. This was acknowledg'd by Ferdinand King of the Romans, and the Estates of the Empire assembled in Diet at Ausbourg in the Year 1555, whose Decree is commonly call'd the *Peace of Religion*. One of the Articles of that Decree is in these Words, 'If our Subjects, or those of the Electors, Princes and States, of the one or the other Religion, shall be desirous for the sake of their Religion to depart out of our Territories, Principalities, Towns and Villages, or out of those of the Electors Princes and States of the holy Roman Empire, and to retire and live with their Wives and Children in some other Place, they shall be permitted and allow'd so to do, as also to sell their Estates and Goods, without Hindrance. This *Peace of Religion* was expressly confirm'd by the Treaty of Munster in 1648, Article 5, §. 1. in these Terms, 'The Treaty agreed at Passau in 1552, and renew'd by the Peace of Religion in 1555, as it was confirm'd at Ausbourg in 1556, and since in several other Diets of the holy Roman Empire, shall in all Points and Articles granted and agreed by the unanimous Consent of the Emperor, and of the Electors, Princes, and States of the two Religions, be maintain'd in its Force and Vigour, and observ'd religiously and inviolably.

The last Article of the Edict of Revocation is in these Words, 'Moreover, those of the said pretended reform'd Religion, wishing till God shall please to enlighten them, as others shall abide in the Towns and Places of our Kingdom, Countries and Territories of our Obedience, and there continue their Commerce, and enjoy their Estates, without being molested or hindred, under Pretext of the said pretended reform'd Religion; on Condition, as said is, not to assemble in Order to perform any religious Exercise, under Pretext of Praying or Worshipping according to the said Religion in any manner whatever, on the Penalties abovemention'd of corporal Punishment and Confiscation of Goods and Estate.

Before we enter into the particular Discussion of these two Articles, it seems necessary to speak of the Methods that have been made Use of to convert the Protestants to the Church of Rome.

It must be allow'd to be a certain and undoubted Principle, that Constraint ought never to be us'd in Matters of Religion. Even the Doctors of the Romish Church agree to this. The Jesuite Azorius (a) proposes this Question, *Whether Pagans under the Dominion of a Christian Prince, may be forc'd to embrace his Religion?* Which he resolves in the Negative, corroborates his Decision by the Authority of the Canon-Law (b), and by St. Thomas (c), says 'tis an Opinion commonly receiv'd, and then gives the Reason of it, 'That seeing Belief proceeds from a voluntary and free Act, 'tis not permitted to bring any one into the Faith by Compulsion; so that the Christian Religion ought not to be subject to Force and Violence; even Men ought not to engage in it through Fear of Death, of Slavery, of Imprisonment, of Torments, or other the like Evils: and we no where find that such kind of Evils were us'd to draw Men at first to the Christian Religion. Religion is not at our Command, because no Person can be compell'd to believe whether he will or no, said the wise King Theodoric (d).

'Tis true St. Thomas in the forecited place, makes a Distinction between Infidels, who never made Profession of the Christian Faith, such as Pagans and Jews; and Infidels, who have receiv'd the Faith, and promis'd to keep it, such as Hereticks and Apostates: He condemns Force with regard to the former, and approves it with regard to the latter. But this cannot be apply'd to the Protestants of France, who were a Church separate from that of Rome, and had their Ministers, publick Assemblies, Consistories, and provincial and national Synods; all by Virtue of a publick Law.

On this Argument something very peculiar with regard to the Protestants of France may be alledg'd, and that is the general Opinion of the Clergy of the same Kingdom. Which Opinion is declar'd in a Remonstrance made in the Name of a general Assembly of that Clergy, and deliver'd at their Head by M. Cornullier Bishop of Rennes to Louis XIII. Their own Words are these, (e) 'We do not pretend to root out their Errors by Constraint and Violence; but acknowledge the Liberty engraven by Nature on the Mind of Man; that what is introduc'd into it by Force is not lasting, nor is of any Merit in Faith, which ought to be spontaneous, and to be insinuated gently by Divine Inspiration.

(a) *Instit. Moral. Tom. 1. lib. 8. Cap. 24. Num. 2.*  
(b) *Caude Jusse. & Can. qui sincera Dis. 45.* (c) 2. 2. 28, 10. Art. 8.

(d) *Cassiodor. 2. Variar. 27.*

(e) *Memoires du Clerge, Paris Edit. towards the End of the 12<sup>th</sup> Vol.*

ration, by Patience, by Exhortations, and by all sorts of good Examples.

The Politicians are of the same Opinion. M. de Priezac Councillor of State, in a Book which he wrote by the King's Command, (f) in answer to another Book (g), has this Passage, 'We should imitate God, who suffers so many things that he does not approve, who does not cast down his Thunder, nor send a second Deluge on the Earth, to punish the infinite Multitude of Sinners. As Faith is a Beam of his divine Light, 'tis a Gift of his meer Grace: Therefore Persuasion ought to be employ'd, not Compulsion; Prayers to God, not Arms; good Instructions, not Edicts; Exhortations, not Menaces. No King has Dominion over the Mind, its Motions are as quick and ungovernable as Flames of Fire. It hardens it self against Violence, takes a contrary Bent from what is offer'd to be impos'd on it, and pushes on to all Extremities. France has always condemn'd the Inquisition; its Name alone gives an Impression of Horror; and besides, it serves only to make Hypocrites.

M. Amelot de la Houllaye agrees in this Opinion. Religion says he, is like Love, *non imperatur*; Command can do nothing in it, Constraint still less; nothing more independant and uncontrollable than to love, and to believe. (h)

The latter Edicts and Declarations of the King of France, forbidding the Protestants to leave the Kingdom and retire elsewhere, refer to an Edict publish'd in August 1669, which prohibits all his Subjects of what Quality or Condition soever, to retire out of the Kingdom to settle themselves without his Leave in foreign Countries, by Marriage, Acquisition of Estates, and removing their Families and Goods there to fix their Habitation, on the Penalty of Imprisonment and Confiscation.

But that Edict is derogatory to natural Liberty, which permits Men to change their Country. The civil Law (i) is expresse and positive in this Case, freely allowing every one to chuse his Abode where he thinks fit; and Cicero in his Oration for Cornelius Balbus extolls that Freedom in magnificent Terms. 'Tis according to the Laws of Nature and Nations, as is prov'd by the most celebrated Authors (k) that have written on this Subject. But 'tis needless to spend Arguments against that Edict: 'Tis sufficient to shew, that it does not at all affect the French Protestants: For it necessarily presupposes that those against whom these Prohibitions are issued, are absolutely and intirely at Liberty to dwell in France: Now that cannot be said of the French Protestants. At in the Sequel of this Piece, which shall be concluded in our next, will (among other Things) be clearly prov'd.

(f) *Vindicia Gallica adversus Alexandrum Patricium Armacanum, Paris, 1638. p. 145.*

(g) *Alex. Patricii Armacani Mars Gallicus, seu de Justitia Armarum in Reg. Gal. A. 1635. Written by Cornelius Jansenius Bishop of Ypres.*

(h) In his Notes on the 101<sup>st</sup> Letter of Cardinal d'Osset.

(i) *De sua cuique Civitate statuendi Facultate libera est. L. in bello 12. §. 9. ff. de Captiv. et Postlim. revers.*

(k) *Grotius de Jure B. & P. lib. 2. Cap. §. 3. N. 2. Puffendorf de Jure Nat. & Gent. lib. 8. Cap. 11. §. 3. and 4.*

Not Acted these five Years.

**A**T the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane, this present Monday, being the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, will be reviv'd a Comedy, call'd, *The Sea Voyage*; or, *The Commonwealth of Women*. With Entertainments of Singing, particularly the Mad Dialogue between Mr. Leveridge and Mrs. Lindsey. And Dancing by Monsieur du Ruel, Monsieur du Bagues, Mrs. Evans and others.

By her Majesty's Company of Comedians.

**A**T the Queen's Theatre in the Hay-Market, this present Monday, being the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, will be presented a Comedy, call'd, *The Northern Lass*, or, *The Nest of Fools*. The parts of Sir Phil. Luckless by Mr. Wilks, Mr. Trydewell by Mr. Mills, Sir Paul Squelch by Mr. Johnson, Squire Wiggin by Mr. Bullock, Captain Anvil by Mr. Bowen, How'd'ee by Mr. Cibber, Nonsense by Mr. Norris, Bullfinch by Mr. Croft. The Northern Lass by Mrs. Bicknell.

For the Encouragement of the Comedians Acting in the Hay-Market, and to enable them to keep the Diversion of Plays under a separate Interest from Operas.

**A**T the Queen's Theatre in the Hay-Market, to Morrow being Tuesday, the 14<sup>th</sup> of January, will be reviv'd the Tragedy of Julius Caesar. By Subscription. The parts of Julius Caesar by Mr. Booth, Octavius Caesar by Mr. Mills, Mark Antony by Mr. Wilks, Brutus by Mr. Betterton, Cassius by Mr. Verbuggen, Caska by Mr. Keene, Ligarius by Mr. Boman, Decius Brutus by Mr. Husbands, Cinna the Poet by Mr. Bowen, 4 Plebeians by Mr. Johnson, Mr. Bullock, Mr. Norris, Mr. Croft, Calphurnia by Mrs. Barry, Portia by Mrs. Bracegirdle. The Boxes to be open'd to the Pit, and none to be admitted but by the Subscribers Tickets, which will be deliver'd this Day and to Morrow Morning at Mr. White's Chocolate-house in St. James's-street.

These Plays are Sold by J. Knapp at the Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard, and B. Lintott next Nando's Coffee-House, Temple-Bar.

Whereas a Note was drawn by Daniel Lock on Stone and Maszin, Bankers, in Lombard-street for 156 l. 7 s. 6 d. dated the 13<sup>th</sup> Instant, payable to William Wicks or Bearer, it being mislaid or lost, any Person that brings it to Mr. Henry Hankey Banker in Fenchurch-street London, shall receive 5 s. Reward. Payment being stop'd it's of no use but to the Owner.

